



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,368	07/09/2001	Nithyalakshmi Sampathkumar	MS180587.1	6483
27195	7590	07/18/2006	EXAMINER	
AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114				HILLERY, NATHAN
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2176		

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/901,368	SAMPATHKUMAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Hillery	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

- Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 4/24/06.
2. Claims 1 – 19 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 19 are independent.
3. The rejection of claims 1 – 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable has been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.
6. Specifically, claim 1 recites, “an output manager that facilitates at least one of selectively pulling and pushing a subset of the transformed XML items prior to transforming the input XML items” (lines 6 – 8).
7. It is unclear how the claimed output manager can pull and/or push the “transformed XML items” before transforming the “input XML items” as required by claim 1, since the “transformed XML items” are a result of the “transformer” transforming the “input XML items” into the “transformed XML items” (lines 3 – 5). For these reasons, the claim is deemed inoperative. Consequently, dependent claims 2 – 18 are also inoperative, since each claim directly or indirectly depend from claim 1. Claim 19 is deemed inoperative for similar reasons.

8. Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

9. Claims 1 - 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 - 19 have no practical application as claimed because there is no physical transformation and no production of a concrete, useful and tangible result.

a. The result of the claimed invention remains in the abstract and is not made available to the user; thus it is not tangible.

b. The claims appear to be in the preliminary stages and fall short of the disclosed practical utility. In other words, the claims fail to fulfill and/or reflect the specific, substantial, and credible utility sought by the disclosed invention, and thus do not produce a useful result.

10. Consequently, the claims are nonstatutory. The claims simply recite transforming and selectively pulling and/or pushing data without producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2176

13. Claim 1 recites, “an output manager that facilitates at least one of selectively pulling and pushing a subset of the transformed XML items prior to transforming the input XML items” (lines 6 – 8). It is unclear how the claimed output manager can pull and/or push the “transformed XML items” before transforming the “input XML items” as required by claim 1, since the “transformed XML items” are a result of the “transformer” transforming the “input XML items” into the “transformed XML items” (lines 3 – 5). Claim 19 is rejected for similar reasons.

14. **Regarding claims 2 – 18**, the claims are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of the base claim(s) from which they depend.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically taught that or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ADO.NET (English translation) and further in view of Omoigui (US 20030126136 A1).

17. **Regarding independent claim 1**, ADO.NET teach that XML data is transformed into a data set object (p 4), which meets the limitation of **a transformer that transforms one or more input XML items in a first format to one or more transformed XML items in one or more second formats**.

18. ADO.NET teach that the XMLDataDocument is created by reading the entire contents of the XML data file (pp 16 and 17), which meets the limitation of **the one or more input XML items comprise a subset of XML items contained in a XML document** (pp 16 and 17).

19. ADO.NET does not explicitly teach that **an output manager that facilitates at least one of selectively pulling and pushing a subset of the transformed XML items prior to transforming the input XML items.**

20. However, Omoigui teaches that a Query Manager and Results Browser that allow for information to be retrieved from a data store and displayed as a list of objects. The Results Browser preferably obtains one or more XML files from the Query Manager and merges these into a single XML file that represents a list of objects (Column 40, paragraph 0759), which meets the limitation of **an output manager that facilitates at least one of selectively pulling and pushing a subset of the transformed XML items prior to transforming the input XML items.**

21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of ADO.NET with the invention of Omoigui because such a combination would provide the readers of ADO.NET with *an integrated and seamless implementation framework and resulting medium for knowledge retrieval, management, delivery and presentation* (Column 5, paragraph 0071).

22. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, ADO.NET does not explicitly teach that **the transformer comprises an action frame stack that holds one or more actions, an**

event state machine that tracks state associated with transforming the one or more XML items and an event processor that receives events generated in processing the one or more actions stored in the action frame stack.

23. However, Omoigui teaches that the system provides support for authentication, authorization, auditing, data privacy, data integrity, availability, and non-repudiation by employing standards such as WS-Security. WS-Security provides a platform for security with XML Web Service applications using standards in the XML Web Service protocol stack. This includes encrypting method calls from clients, support for digital signatures, authenticating the calling user before granting access to an Agency's Semantic Network and XML Web Service methods, etc. (paragraph 0367), which meets the limitation of **the transformer comprises an action frame stack that holds one or more actions, an event state machine that tracks state associated with transforming the one or more XML items and an event processor that receives events generated in processing the one or more actions stored in the action frame stack.**

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of ADO.NET with the invention of Omoigui because such a combination would provide the readers of ADO.NET with *an integrated and seamless implementation framework and resulting medium for knowledge retrieval, management, delivery and presentation* (Column 5, paragraph 0071).

25. **Regarding dependent claim 3,** ADO.NET does not explicitly teach that a **compiler that compiles one or more style sheets and produce one or more**

actions that can be employed by the transformer in processing associated with transforming the one or more input XML items.

26. However, Omoigui teaches that effectively, SQML interpreter "compiles" the SQML file before "executing" it. The client uses the XSLT templates in the "<skin>" tags to display the information for each declared object type. Any returned objects that do not have a declared Skin are displayed with the default Skin of the object type or, in the case of a single Agent entry, that of the Agent (paragraph 0971), which meets the limitation of **a compiler that compiles one or more style sheets and produce one or more actions that can be employed by the transformer in processing associated with transforming the one or more input XML items.**

27. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of ADO.NET with the invention of Omoigui because such a combination would provide the readers of ADO.NET with *an integrated and seamless implementation framework and resulting medium for knowledge retrieval, management, delivery and presentation* (Column 5, paragraph 0071).

28. **Regarding dependent claim 4,** ADO.NET does not explicitly teach that **the compiler resolves one or more external references in the one or more style sheets.**

29. However, Omoigui teaches that context arguments are resolved by the client-side SQML compiler at run-time in which the arguments can include references to local

or remote context (paragraph 0274), which meets the limitation of **the compiler resolves one or more external references in the one or more style sheets.**

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of ADO.NET with the invention of Omoigui because such a combination would provide the readers of ADO.NET with *an integrated and seamless implementation framework and resulting medium for knowledge retrieval, management, delivery and presentation* (Column 5, paragraph 0071).

31. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, ADO.NET teach that the data provider provides the data from a data store (p 5 – upper right hand corner), which meets the limitation of **the input XML items are input from one or more data stores.**

32. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, ADO.NET teach that an XpathNavigator is created to abstract data from the xml data set via an XpathNodeIterator by employing a loop (p 19), which meets the limitation of **an input abstracter that exposes data stored in the one or more data stores in a common representation.**

33. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, ADO.NET teach that an XpathNavigator is created to abstract data from the xml data set via an XpathNodeIterator (p 19), which meets the limitation of **the input abstractor abstracts a reference to a node within an Xpath document.**

34. **Regarding dependent claims 8,** ADO.NET teach that an XpathNavigator is created to abstract data from the xml data set (p 19), which meets the limitation of **the input abstractor exposes the data stored in the one or more data stores as a data model and infoset.**

35. **Regarding dependent claim 9,** ADO.NET teach that an XpathNavigator is created to abstract data from the xml data set and sends the data to an XSLT (p 19), which meets the limitation of **the input abstractor provides a cursor model over data stored in a data store to facilitate presenting a stream of nodes to the transformer.**

36. **Regarding dependent claims 10,** ADO.NET teach that an XpathNavigator is created to abstract data from the xml data set (p 19), which meets the limitation of **the input abstractor provides a virtual node that can be employed to traverse the stream of nodes.**

37. **Regarding dependent claim 11,** ADO.NET teach that an XpathNavigator is created to abstract data from the xml data set (p 19), which meets the limitation of **the input abstractor is an XpathNavigator.**

38. **Regarding dependent claim 12,** ADO.NET teach that SQL is used to query xml items and store them to an XML data set and that each node in the xml dataset is

visited by employing an XpathNodeIterator (pp 18 – 19), which meets the limitation of a node selection abstractor that dynamically constructs a subset of input XML items from a set of input XML items, where the subset of input XML items are responsive to a query.

39. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, ADO.NET teach that each node in the xml dataset is visited by employing an XpathNodeIterator (pp 18 – 19), which meets the limitation of the node selection abstractor facilitates navigating the subset of input XML items.

40. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, ADO.NET teach that each node in the xml dataset is visited by employing an XpathNodeIterator (pp 18 – 19), which meets the limitation of the node selection abstractor is an XpathNodeIterator.

41. **Regarding dependent claim 15**, ADO.NET teach that SQL is used to query xml items and store them to an XML data set (pp 18 – 19), which meets the limitation of an optimized data store that stores one or more XML items in a manner that facilitates minimizing processing associated with constructing the subset of input XML items via a query (pp 18 – 19).

42. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, ADO.NET teach that Xpath document is created and used to store and manipulate the xml data set (pp 18 – 19), which meets

the limitation of **the optimized data store stores data in a data representation format that facilitates optimizing an Xpath query.**

43. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, ADO.NET teach that Xpath document is created and used to expand the items in the xml data store so that they can be transformed using an XSLT (pp 18 – 19), which meets the limitation of **the data representation format comprises expanded XML entities, deleted XML declarations and DOM model data converted to Xpath model data.**

44. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, ADO.NET teach that Xpath document is created and used to store and manipulate the xml data set (pp 18 – 19), which meets the limitation of **the optimized data store is an XpathDocument.**

45. **Regarding independent claim 19**, the claim incorporates substantially similar subject matt as claims 1, 3 – 6, and 12, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

46. Applicant's arguments filed 4/24/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

47. Applicant argues that ADO.Net fails to teach **a transformer that transforms one or more input XML items in a first format to one or more transformed XML items**

in one or more second formats (p 7, first full paragraph) because the transformed XML item is not an XML item.

48. The Office disagrees.

49. It should be noted that by Applicant's own admission, ADO.Net does teach a transformation from XML data to a data set object (p 7, first full paragraph, lines 8 – 10). Within the broadest, reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, the claim does not necessarily require that "the transformed XML item" be an actual XML item. The Office has interpreted the claimed "transformed XML item" to be representative of the result of transforming "the input XML item" where that result may or may not be an XML item. For instance, the claim recites "input XML items in a first format" in which the first format can be interpreted as XML and "transformed XML items in one or more second formats" in which the second format is in a format other than XML such as the data set object of ADO.Net.

50. Applicant argues that ADO.Net fails to teach a **subset of XML items contained in a XML document** (p 7, last paragraph) because all of the XML items are processed rather than a subset.

51. The Office disagrees.

52. It should be noted that even if the Office agrees with Applicant's description of ADO.Net that the entire contents are read in (p 7, last line – p 8, first line), then the cited portions of ADO.Net still read on the claim, since the subset of a set can be the entire set. Again, within the broadest, reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, the

claim does not necessarily require that the “subset of XML items contained in a XML document” be less than or different from all the XML items contained in the document.

53. In response to Applicant’s arguments that ADO.Net is not an enabling reference (p 8, second paragraph) because the reference as disclosed would involve undue experimentation.

54. The Office disagrees.

55. It is believed enabling to the level necessary to provide the teachings relied upon by the Office. It should be noted that the Applicant has merely made conclusionary statements without providing any factual evidence or other specific reasons as to how and why the reference is not enabled for the features relied upon by the Office. Instead, the lack of enablement argument appears to be merely Applicant’s opinion.

56. Applicant argues that Omoigui fails to teach **a subset of XML items contained in a XML document** (p 8, last paragraph) because an entire set is received rather than a subset.

57. The Office disagrees.

58. It should be noted that even if the Office agrees with Applicant’s description of Omoigui that the entire contents are read in (p 8, last line – p 9, first line), then the cited portions of Omogui still read on the claim, since the subset of a set can be the entire set. Again, within the broadest, reasonable interpretation in light of the specification, the

claim does not necessarily require that the “subset of the transformed XML items” be less than or different from the entire set.

Conclusion

59. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Hillery whose telephone number is (571) 272-4091. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F, 10:30 a.m. - 7:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2176

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NH



HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100